

TERESA JORDAN 3152 SHAD COURT SIMI VALLEY, CA 93063 TELEPHONE NO. (805)522-5016

TO: Mr. Van Dabbs, Chief
Unter Resources Evaluation Section Statewide Planning Branch
California DWR PO Box 942836
Sacramento, (A 94236-0001
FAX NO.: (9/6) 651-9289
DATE: August 4, 2005
NO. OF PAGES: 5 (includes cover sheet)
RE: CA Water Plan Update 2005, August 17,
Advigory Committee Meeting, and
Public Review Draft Public Comments List

3152 Shad Court Simi Valley, CA 93063 August 4, 2005

Mr. Paul Dabbs, Chief Water Resources Evaluation Section Statewide Planning Branch California DWR PO Box 942836 Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

Re: California Water Plan Update 2005, August 17, 2005
Advisory Committee Meeting, and Public Review Draft
Website Public Comments List.

Dear Mr. Dabbs:

I checked my letters of July 22, 2005, July 27, 2005, and August 3, 2005 and realized that I have not covered the matter of "public funding" per se, though I have in a round about way touched base on the issue, nor on the "public education", even though I have talked about the public participation process, or "population trends". Not knowing when comments posting will end, please forward this letter to the Advisory Committee for its August 17, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Dabbs, as far as "public funding" is concerned, whether it involves State legislation, or local government voter measures, the information must disclose all related costs. There must not be any kind or type of deception involved by legislators, county supervisors, city councils, and government employees!!!

Sir, people work hard for the \$. I have found that it is so easy to just submit applications to State agencies for projects that should have been covered by local governments, but instead submittals are forwarded in order for those funds to go for business expansion or relocation incentives, or to cover mismanagement by employees, or poor planning by the elected officials, or to get someone else to pay for mitigation measures conditioned on development projects that impact the waters of the State and Federal government. Too often, propositions are passed by voters whose heart strings are pulled to get measures passed. And, politicians are only too happy to be legislating California

laws. Such have been my comments on A.B. 1003--amending the Ventura County Watershed Protection Act to Authorize the Ventura County Watershed Protection District to levy property-related fees--to Governor Schwarzenegger, the Senate and Assembly for the past couple of months because constituents will be faced with six fold costs.

Sir, with regards to "population trends", I don't know how long this has been taking place, but for the past 5 years I have noticed that many grandparents are taking in children and grandchildren, or relatives, parents are again having the non-empty nest effect, and homes are overcrowded due to economic impacts, death, divorce, etceteras. The households that used little water are suddenly experiencing a major increase. Has this subject been covered in the Draft Plan? I don't believe that this situation will be lessened anytime soon. If anything, the extremely high cost of homes, and lack of affordable housing will see the trend multiply perhaps by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Dabbs, even though I have been around the block on various city, county, state, and federal government plans, I am stymied every once in a while when an updated or new document comes up for consideration. I had to go into the Water Code in order to find out who is the authority that will eventually approve the Final Plan. Information like this must be readily available on legal public notices to educate the targeted audience. I find that lack of pertinent information is one of the main sticking points for lack of public participation. This is one area where the power point presentations material in booklet form, or some kind of handout form—instead of just the Website—would be ideal, and get the results that DWR has aimed for.

Sir, I am a novice as far as working with computers and programs, even though I search websites, and the Internet. I was beside myself trying to figure out whether or not to click "Yes", or "No"--I kept clicking "Cancel" but kept getting back to the information and an endless return to "Y" and "N" by using the back button; I didn't dare click the "X"--when I got into the January 20, 2005 Advisory Committee meeting summary. First of all it was in file form where I have to decide if I want to jeopardize the computer's welfare--though I would not change this format since it was posted way back then. Clicking "Yes" took me into our filing system--which I have never worked with.

"No" the first time took me completely out of the meeting material calendar and back to the news releases section of the Website. Second time around I had not clicked everything so I was back to the calendar, and finally out of the Website to finish this letter. While this effort helps me learn, it is time consuming, and time is money.

The power point presentations are wonderful, but not ideal for printing-too much toner is used. For future presentations in this form that are posted on the DWR Website, please have in pdf form instead of requiring the reader to open a file in order to download the information for printing capability in the future. No one should have to go to extremes, or end up with jumbled nerves to become informed/educated!!!

Mr. Dabbs, thank you for re-posting the San Joaquin FBF, Ms. Foster, Mr. Nesmith, and League of Women Voters under the Author column, and including #124 in the Comments List per my August 3, 2005 letter request. I notice that #s 23, 26, 33, and 42, are still missing, and deletion of authors Traci Billington, Lloyd Fryer, Milan Cernosek, and John Sarna has not been corrected.

Sir, since the number of missing #s is even with the deleted authors this matter can easily be taken care of. Otherwise, just re-number every comment. These problems must not go unchecked. The DWR is on a roll. Please don't let this correctable simple glitch continue. Otherwise, you affect all of the outstanding effort that has gone into the Plan, such as the Website's Meetings Materials: 1. the calendar where readers can go to learn what has taken place, and 2. to then click and print agendas, summaries, power point presentations, work sheets, etceteras.

Mr. Dabbs, because comments from the deleted authors was public information, they must be re-posted on the DWR Website ASAP.

Mr. Dabbs, if for some reason, the DWR doesn't want the deleted authors comments posted, then I kindly request copies of their comments under the California Records Act.

Mr. Dabbs, I notice that my July 27, 2005 letter--which included my order of Draft Plan documents, and questions-- has not been posted on the Website. My comments on my City's Regional Stormwater Detention Basins project and its

Water Plan must be made part of the record. Please note that the second sentence of the first paragraph of the first page should have read "period for the Draft has ended". And, the second to last sentence of the last paragraph on Page 2 should have read "let me know".

Finally, though I have not read all 5 volumes, from what I have read it seems to me that Ventura County is being shortchanged as far as coverage is concerned. Am I mistaken? I notice that the county is split with the upper most westerly section being combined with the Santa Barbara area discussions. Why is this? When the watershed management planning approach was undertaken, Ventura County was lost in the shuffle too many times because emphasis was mostly placed on the Los Angeles region.

Sincerely

Mrs. Teresa Jordan